

V. REMARKS

The Office Action objects to claim 5. The claim is amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Ozaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031658). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ozaki teaches a pattern display device that includes a pattern display unit and a front side display unit. The pattern display unit has a display portion for displaying a plurality of different first patterns. Also, the pattern display unit is capable of performing a stationary display and a varying display. The front side display unit is disposed in front of the pattern display unit and is capable of displaying a plurality of different second patterns overlapping with the plurality of first patterns. Further, the front side display unit is transparent except for the plurality of second patterns. Also, the front side display unit has a matrix type display portion that displays the plurality of second patterns and the matrix type display portion is composed of a transparent EL panel. The display portion of the pattern display unit is divided into a plurality of first display regions with each displaying one of the plurality of first patterns as the stationary display.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a gaming machine that includes a game result display device for performing a predetermined display relating to a game result, a game value providing device for providing a game value advantageous to a player when a predetermined game result is displayed on the game result display device and a display control device for executing display control of the game result display device. Claim 1 recites that the game result display device includes a first display device, a second display device and a third display device. Claim 1 further recites that the first display device is in a form of at

least one reel operative to rotate about an axis of rotation, the second display device is disposed in front of the first display device when the gaming machine is viewed from a front side thereof with the second display device being in a form of a liquid crystal display panel and the third display device is disposed in front of the first display device when the gaming machine is viewed from the front side and is in a form of another liquid crystal display panel with the second and third display device being facially opposed to one another with the third display device being disposed between the first and second display device.

Further, claim 1 recites that the second display device includes at least one transparent display area operative between a transparent condition for transparently displaying the display of the first display device through the second display device and a non-transparent condition. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the third display device includes at least one display shielding area for selectively shielding the display of the first display device with the at least one display shielding area corresponding to the at least one transparent display area. Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the display shielding area is controllably switched to either a view-inhibition state in which the display of the first display device is shielded to prevent or inhibit viewing of the first display device through the second display device regardless if the at least one transparent area is in the transparent condition or the non-transparent condition or a viewing state in which the display of the first display device is transparently displayed for viewing through the second display device via the third display device when the at least one transparent display area is in the transparent condition. Also, claim 1 recites that the third display device is disposed in front of the first display device and is disposed between the first and second display device

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 as amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art, alone or in combination, fails to teach that the first display device is in a form of at least one

reel operative to rotate about an axis of rotation, the second display device is disposed in front of the first display device when the gaming machine is viewed from a front side thereof with the second display device being in a form of a liquid crystal display panel and the third display device is disposed in front of the first display device when the gaming machine is viewed from the front side and is in a form of another liquid crystal display panel with the second and third display device being facially opposed to one another with the third display device being disposed between the first and second display device. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art also fails to teach that the second display device includes at least one transparent display area operative between a transparent condition for transparently displaying the display of the first display device through the second display device and a non-transparent condition and that the third display device includes at least one display shielding area for selectively shielding the display of the first display device with the at least one display shielding area corresponding to the at least one transparent display area. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art also fails to teach that the display shielding area is controllably switched to either a view-inhibition state in which the display of the first display device is shielded to prevent or inhibit viewing of the first display device through the second display device regardless if the at least one transparent area is in the transparent condition or the non-transparent condition or a viewing state in which the display of the first display device is transparently displayed for viewing through the second display device via the third display device when the at least one transparent display area is in the transparent condition. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Furthermore, Ozaki discloses in the paragraphs [0137] to [0139] and Fig. 27 that a (transparent) liquid crystal shutter 23 is disposed at a more near position to a front side of a machine than that of a liquid crystal 5. Further, the liquid crystal shutter 23 is formed so as to cover the whole surface of the liquid crystal 5, and therefore when the liquid crystal shutter 23 is closed (or shut down), both of

symbols of a reel 2 and an image of the liquid crystal 5 become invisible. When the liquid crystal shutter 23 is opened, the both of the symbols and the image become visible.

Accordingly, in a machine disclosed in Ozaki, it is impossible to cause symbols of a reel 2 (corresponding to the first display device) to become invisible with keeping the image displayed a liquid crystal corresponding to the second display device.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Claim 2 is canceled and, as a result, the rejection as applied thereto is now moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reasons claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Loose (U.S. Patent No. 6,517,433). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Loose teaches a spinning reel slot machine that includes a plurality of mechanical rotatable reels and a video display. In response to a wager, the reels are rotated and stopped to randomly place symbols on the reels in visual association with a display area. The video display provides a video image superimposed upon the reels. The video image may be interactive with the reels and include such graphics as payout values, a pay table, pay lines, bonus game features, special effects, thematic scenery and instructional information.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reasons claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

By:


Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (3 months)

DC280562.DOC